

Appl. No. : **10/840,198**
Filed : **May 5, 2004**

REMARKS

The March 9, 2005 Office Action was based upon pending Claims 1-9. This Amendment amends Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7, and adds new Claims 30-40. Thus, after entry of this Amendment, Claims 1-9, and 30-40 are pending and presented for further consideration.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 7-9 because they are the redundant claims of Claims 4-6.

Further, the Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of co-pending Application No. 10/017,826.

In addition, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,011,710 ("the Wiggers patent").

OBJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-9

The Examiner objected to Claims 7-9 because they are the redundant claims of Claims 4-6. In response, Applicant has amended Claims 7-9 such that Claims 7-9 are not redundant to Claims 4-6. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection to Claims 7-9.

PROVISIONAL DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9

The Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-9 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of co-pending Application No. 10/017,826.

Applicant acknowledges the provisional double patenting rejection. However, since the claims in this application have not been allowed, a terminal disclaimer is not yet appropriate. Applicant will submit a terminal disclaimer when the identified claims have been allowed in both applications if the claims have not otherwise been amended to overcome the double patenting rejection.

Appl. No. : **10/840,198**
Filed : **May 5, 2004**

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,011,710 ("the Wiggers patent").

Claims 1, 4, and 7

Wiggers appears to teach a switch between a memory device and a data bus on a printed circuit board. Wiggers also appears to teach a memory controller controlling the switch. Wiggers does not teach a state decoder controlling the switch.

In contrast, in an embodiment of the invention, a state decoder controls the switch. The reference cited by the Examiner does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of a state decoder interfacing with the memory controller and the switch such that the state decoder controls the switch to decouple the data bus from the memory circuit when no memory access is being requested by the memory controller to reduce the parasitic capacitance of the data bus.

Because the reference cited by the Examiner does not disclose, teach, or suggest the use of a state decoder and a memory controller, Applicant asserts that Claims 1, 4 and 7 are not anticipated by Wiggers. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Claims 1, 4 and 7 are patentably distinguished over the cited reference and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1, 4, and 7.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9

Claims 2 and 3, which depend from Claim 1, Claims 5 and 6, which depend from Claim 4, and Claims 8 and 9, which depend from Claim 7, are believed to be patentable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claims 1, 4, and 7 respectively, and because of the additional features recited therein.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 30-33 depend from amended Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 1, and because of the additional features recited therein.

Appl. No. : 10/840,198
Filed : May 5, 2004

New Claims 34-37 depend from amended Claim 4 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 4, and because of the additional features recited therein.

New Claims 38-40 depend from amended Claim 7 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons articulated above with respect to Claim 4, and because of the additional features recited therein.

New Claims 30-40 have been added to more fully define the Applicant's invention and are believed to be fully distinguished over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. In light of the above remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/21/05

By: John R. King
John R. King
Registration No. 34,362
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404